

UNITED STATE OF COMMERCE **Patent and Trademark Office**

Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS

Washington, D.C. 20231

APPLICATION NO. FILING DATE FIRST NAMED INVENTOR ATTORNEY DOCKET NO. 09/220,398 12/24/98 HARNEY V0V-003.02

025181

FOLEY, HOAG & ELIOT, LLP PATENT GROUP ONE POST OFFICE SQUARE BOSTON MA 02109

HM12/0320

EXAMINER

RILEY, J

ART UNIT

1656

PAPER NUMBER

DATE MAILED:

03/20/01

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Commissioner of Patents and Trademarks

Office Action Summary

Application No. 09/220,398 Applicant(s)

Harney

Examiner

Jezia Riley

Group Art Unit 1656



Responsive to communication(s) filed on <u>Jan 2, 2001</u>	
☐ This action is FINAL .	
Since this application is in condition for allowance except for in accordance with the practice under <i>Ex parte Quayle</i> , 1935	
A shortened statutory period for response to this action is set to solve solve longer, from the mailing date of this communication. Failure to application to become abandoned. (35 U.S.C. § 133). Extension 37 CFR 1.136(a).	respond within the period for response will cause the
Disposition of Claims	
X Claim(s) 1-42	is/are pending in the application.
Of the above, claim(s)	is/are withdrawn from consideration.
☐ Claim(s)	is/are allowed.
	is/are rejected.
Claim(s)	
☐ Claims	
Application Papers	
☐ See the attached Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing	Review, PTO-948.
☐ The drawing(s) filed on is/are objecte	ed to by the Examiner.
☐ The proposed drawing correction, filed on	is 🗀 approved 🗀 disapproved.
\square The specification is objected to by the Examiner.	
☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.	
Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119	
\square Acknowledgement is made of a claim for foreign priority u	nder 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d).
☐ All ☐ Some* ☐ None of the CERTIFIED copies of	the priority documents have been
☐ received.	
received in Application No. (Series Code/Serial Num	
received in this national stage application from the li	nternational Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
☐ Acknowledgement is made of a claim for domestic priority	vunder 35 U.S.C. § 119(e).
Attachment(s)	
☐ Notice of References Cited, PTO-892	
Information Disclosure Statement(s), PTO-1449, Paper No.	(s)
Interview Summary, PTO-413Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review, PTO-948	3
☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application, PTO-152	•
SEE OFFICE ACTION ON TH	HE FOLLOWING PAGES

Office Action Summary

Serial Number: 09/00,398

DETAILED ACTION

Art Unit: 1656

Continued Prosecution Application

1. The request filed on ½/01 for a Continued Prosecution Application (CPA) under 37 CFR 1.53(d) based on parent Application No. 09/220,398 is acceptable and a CPA has been established. An action on the CPA follows.

Response to Remarks

2. Applicants' arguments and amendments, filed on ½/01, have been approved and entered. They have been fully considered but they are not deemed to be persuasive. Rejections and/or objections not reiterated from previous office actions are hereby withdrawn. The following rejections and/or objections are either newly applied or reiterated. They constitute the complete set presently being applied to the instant application.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103 (a)

- 3. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:
 - (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

Subject matter developed by another person, which qualifies as prior art only under subsection (f) or (g) of section 102 of this title, shall not preclude patentability under this section where the subject matter and the claimed invention were, at the time the invention was made, owned by the same person or subject to an obligation of assignment to the same person.

Art Unit: 1656

This application currently names joint inventors. In considering patentability of the claims under 35 U.S.C. § 103, the examiner presumes that the subject matter of the various claims was commonly owned at the time any inventions covered therein were made absent any evidence to the contrary. Applicant is advised of the obligation under 37 C.F.R. § 1.56 to point out the inventor and invention dates of each claim that was not commonly owned at the time a later invention was made in order for the examiner to consider the applicability of 35 U.S.C. 103% and potential 35 U.S.C. § 102(f) or (g) prior art under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a).

- 4. Claims 1-42 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Watson et al. (1992 "Recombinant DNA, Second Ed. Pp. 206-209) in view of Goodchild (Bioconjugate Chemistry, Vol. 1, pp. 165-187, May/June 1990, and Applicant's admissions and in further view of the 1988 Stratagene Catalog.
- 5. Applicants are having the argument that the references do not teach or suggest the present invention. This is not convincing because Watson teach that "the oligonucleotides are designed to so that each one anneals to two adjacent oligonucleotides". Watson also teaches different component categories such as structural genes or fragments of structural genes. "The domain that bound DNA", "Identifying a functional domain" page 207. Further, it is stated in page 209 col.2: "And the ability to operate on DNA lets us also change the structure of the products gene".

Double Patenting

6. The nonstatutory double patenting rejection is based on a judicially created doctrine grounded in public policy (a policy reflected in the statute) so as to prevent the unjustified or improper timewise extension of the "right to exclude" granted by a patent and to prevent possible harassment by multiple assignees. See In re Goodman, 11 F.3d 1046, 29 USPQ2d 2010 (Fed. Cir. 1993); In re Longi, 759 F.2d 887, 225 USPQ 645 (Fed. Cir. 1985); In re Van Ornum, 686 F.2d 937, 214 USPQ 761 (CCPA 1982); In re Vogel, 422

F.2d 438, 164 USPQ 619 (CCPA 1970); and, In re Thorington, 418 F.2d 528, 163 USPQ 644 (CCPA 1969).

A timely filed terminal disclaimer in compliance with 37 CFR 1.321© may be used to overcome an actual or provisional rejection based on a nonstatutory double patenting ground provided the conflicting application or patent is shown to be commonly owned with this application. See 37 CFR 1.130(b).

Effective January 1, 1994, a registered attorney or agent of record may sign a terminal disclaimer. A terminal disclaimer signed by the assignee must fully comply with 37 CFR 3.73(b).

- 7. Claims 1-42 are rejected under the judicially created doctrine of obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claims 78-94 of U.S. Patent No. 08/877,034. Although the conflicting claims are not identical, they are not patentably distinct from each other because they are claiming common embodiments but not of the same scope.
- 8. No claim is allowed.

Conclusion

Any inquiry concerning this communication or communications from the examiner should be directed to Jezia Riley whose telephone number is (703) 305-6855. The Examiner may normally be reached Monday through Friday, 0900 - 1700 EST. attempts to reach the Examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the Examiner's Supervisor, Gary Jones, may be reached at (703) 308-1152.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application should be directed to the Group Receptionist whose telephone number is (703) 308-0196.

Any necessary fax can be sent to (703) 308-4242.